From: Saric, James

To: Griffith, Garry T.; Jeff.Keiser@CH2M.com; "BUCHOLTZP@michigan.gov"
Cc: P. E. Michael Erickson (michael.erickson@arcadis-us.com); Fortenberry, Chase

Subject: RE: Kalamazoo - Eco Screening Criteria

Date: Tuesday, February 26, 2013 11:27:00 AM

Garry,

I am sure Jeff is going to have Frank Dillon look into this further. I guess I am confused after your presentation on 2/20. It was my understanding that based upon Appendix M in the RI report and the outline presented in our meeting on 11/28 that we were in agreement on the approach to the white paper addressing non-PCB constituents. I thought the ECO screening we presented in both Appendix M and in the 11/28 outline as well.

Certainly there were some metals and SVOCs that get through the screening process, that can't be tied to residual materials, but they could be tied to background upstream sediment concentrations and other non-papermaking processes.

My thought was the white paper was going to combine the most recent data with Appendix M.

I guess your presentation didn't make it clear what the problem was with the non-PCB screening.

Jim

From: Griffith, Garry T. [mailto:gtgriffi@GAPAC.com]

Sent: Monday, February 25, 2013 9:15 AM **To:** Saric, James; Jeff.Keiser@CH2M.com

Cc: P. E. Michael Erickson (michael.erickson@arcadis-us.com); Fortenberry, Chase

Subject: Kalamazoo - Eco Screening Criteria

Jim and Jeff,

As requested during our February 20 meeting, attached are the soil and sediment ecological screening criteria used in the non-PCB COC analysis. Please advise if you are aware of other criteria that may be more suitable for this analysis.

Thanks,

Garry Griffith, P.E. Georgia-Pacific LLC

734.735.0780